

REMARKS

The claims have not been amended. Claims 1-15 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 7-9, and 15 are independent claims. The specification has been amended to correct certain informalities. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least at page 3, line 22 to page 4, line 4 of the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Drawing Objection – Amendments to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because they must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the examiner asserts in the Office Action that “a plurality of pixels, a plurality of first electrode, a second electrode, a plurality of light emitting elements, a light emitting layer, a plurality of transistors, a power supply voltage line, and a fed back of current line (a fed back line using for feeding back current from the second electrode to the display controller) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).” Office Action, page 2.

Applicants respectfully traverse this objection on the basis of the amendments to the drawings included in the Reply filed on October 14, 2005, which include replacement Figures 1 and 2, and a new Figure 4. To expedite prosecution, Applicants now submit replacement figure sheets for Figures 1 and 4, which include the changes, without markings, identified below.

Figure 1 has been amended to show a feedback current line from the display panel 23 to the current voltage converter 11, as shown in the attached drawing sheets.

Figure 4 has been amended to show a feedback current line from the second electrode 405, as shown in the attached drawing sheets.

Applicants submit that every feature of the invention specified in the claims is properly shown in the drawings, and respectfully request withdrawal of the drawing objection.

Specification Objection

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to because certain “limitations of the elements in the invention are not shown in the Brief Description of the Drawings.” See Office Action, page 3. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no requirement to show “limitations of the elements in the invention” in the Brief Description of the Drawings and request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Claim Objection

In the Office Action, claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 9 are allowable in view of the following remarks. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection for claims 2, 4-6, 10 and 12-14, which depend from allowable claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0063078 applied for by Hanari, *et al.* (“Hanari”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection improper.

Hanari fails to disclose every feature of claim 1. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

a display controller for using a current value fed back from the second electrode of the display panel and externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data and generate RGB display data, ...

wherein the display controller determines an amount of emitted light on the corresponding screen according to the fed back current ... (emphasis added).

The examiner asserts that Hanari discloses these features at figure 15 and paragraphs [0073], [0077], [0081]-[0082]. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, Hanari fails to disclose “a current value fed back from the second electrode of the display panel.” The examiner cites to Hanari’s figure 15 for this feature. Specifically, the examiner submits that “figure 15 shows a fed [sic] back from the signal line driver [XD] or the second electrode to the controller [32].” Office Action, page 4. However, the only line connected to both the signal line driver XD and the controller 32 is the input DC power line, shown in the bottom left of figure 15, which provides a “DC power-supply voltage supplied from the exterior” to the controller 32, the DC/DC converter 33, and the signal line driver XD. See Hanari, paragraph [0071], lines 12-13. Further, “a current value fed back from the second electrode of the display panel” is not enumerated among the inputs to the controller 32. See

Hanari, paragraph [0071], lines 17-29; figure 15. Therefore, Hanari fails to disclose at least this feature of claim 1.

Second, since Hanari fails to disclose “a current value fed back from the second electrode,” Hanari also necessarily fails to disclose “wherein the display controller determines an amount of emitted light on the corresponding screen according to the fed back current” (emphasis added).

Third, Hanari fails to disclose “correct[ing] a white gray level of the RGB data.” According to Hanari, the organic EL display device includes a dimmer switch portion 34 “to cause all of the organic EL elements 16 to emit light when the switch control signal SC is set at the high level” or “to interrupt light emission of all the organic EL elements 16 when the switch control signal SC is set at the low level.” Hanari, paragraph [0080], lines 7-12. Even though the ratio of luminous time to non-luminous time can be controlled by a high-level to low-level ratio of the switch control signal SC to adjust the luminance of the display screen, activation of the dimmer switch portion 34 does nothing more than turn all pixels on or off by breaking or completing the circuit. See, e.g., Hanari, Figures 13, 14; paragraphs [0055], [0075], [0096], [0098]. Hanari discloses no correction of RGB data. Therefore, unlike the present invention, Hanari fails to disclose “correct[ing] a white gray level of the RGB data.”

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Hanari fails to disclose every feature of claim 1.

Hanari also fails to disclose all features of claims 7-9 and 15 for at least the reasons asserted above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, “a display controller for using a current value fed back from at least one second electrode of the display panel and externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data and generate RGB display data” (emphasis added).

Claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, “using a current value fed back from a second electrode of the display panel and externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data and generate RGB display data” (emphasis added).

Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, “a display controller for using a current value fed back from an electrode of the display panel and externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data and generate RGB display data” (emphasis added).

Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, “using a current value fed back from an electrode of a display panel and externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data and generate RGB display data” (emphasis added).

As asserted above for claim 1, these limitations of claims 7-9 and 15 are not disclosed by Hanari.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, and 15. Claim 3 depends from claim 1, and claim 11 depends from claim 9. These claims are allowable at least for their dependence from allowable base claims. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7-9, and 15, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 contain allowable subject matter, and assert that claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 are allowable for depending from claims 1 and 9, which are allowable claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: June 7, 2007

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/kbs